UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/607,966	06/27/2003	Rotem Cooper	030292	3059

23696 7590 07/31/2008

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED
5775 MOREHOUSE DR.
SAN DIEGO, CA 92121

EXAMINER	
KARIKARI, KWASI	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2617	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/31/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

us-docketing@qualcomm.com
kascanla@qualcomm.com
nanm@qualcomm.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/607,966	COOPER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KWASI KARIKARI	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 June 2008*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *11-16 and 24 are cancelled* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) *20-23 and 25-28* is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1-10 and 17-19* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06/27/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere* Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-10 and 17-19 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimha (U.S 20040160918 A1), (hereinafter Narasimha) in view of Le et al., (U.S 6,556,820) (hereinafter, Lee).

Regarding claims 1, 5 ,17 and 19, Narasimha discloses an apparatus/method (= mobile terminal 100, see Par. 0022 and Fig. 1) in a code division multiple access (CDMA) communication network, comprising:

a message processor operative to process a first signaling message received from a base station in the CDMA network (= broadcast of system information; and system information is available to mobile station 100, see Par. 0031); and

a controller (= controller 170) operative to obtain a network operator identifier NOI from the first signaling message, search a network identification (NID) value field of a preferred roaming list for an entry with the NOI (= mobile scan for available channel; and determines if the SID and /or NID of the system is listed on the PRL, see Pars. 0031-32), and provide an indication of whether or not the CDMA network is accessible based on result of the search (= mobile station 100 remains on the most preferred channel, once a channel in the most preferred system is acquired, see Par. 0032) wherein the network operator identifier distinctly identifies a network operator of the CDMA network (see Par. 0023); but fails to mention "the network operator identifier comprises a mobile country code MCC and network operator code (NOC)".

However, Le teaches "the network operator identifier comprises a mobile country code MCC and network operator code (NOC)"(see col. 8, lines 11-21 and col. 9, lines 4-20).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Le with the system of Narasimha for the benefit of achieving a mobility management system that provides support for multiple subscriptions and

achieves very high efficiency of signaling procedures over the air interface (see Le; col. 4, lines 50-63).

Regarding claims 2, 6 and 18, as recited in claims 1, 5 and 17, Narasimha discloses the apparatus, wherein the message processor is further operative to process a second signaling message received from the base station, and wherein the controller is further operative to extract a system identification (SID) value and a network identification (NID) value from the second signaling message and compare the extracted SID and NID values against SID and NID values stored in the preferred roaming list (= broadcast of system information; system information is available to mobile station 100; and determining if SID and/or NID is the PRL, see Pars. 0023 and 0031-32).

Regarding claims 3 and 7, as recited in claims 2 and 6, Narasimha discloses the apparatus, wherein the controller is operative to obtain the network operator identifier and search the preferred roaming list only if the extracted SID and NID values do not match the SID and NID values stored in the preferred roaming list (see Pars. 0031-32).

Regarding claim 4 and 12, as recited in claims 1 and 5, Narasimha discloses the apparatus, wherein, to search for the network operator identifier in the preferred roaming list, the controller is operative to encode the network operator identifier into a system identification (SID) value and a network identification (NID) value and compare

the encoded SID and NID values against SID and NID values stored in the preferred roaming list (= broadcast of system information; system information is available to mobile station 100; and determining if SID and/or NID is the PRL, see Pars. 0023 and 0031-32).

Regarding claim 8, as recited in claim 5, Narasimha fails to specifically to disclose the method, wherein the network operator identifier comprises a mobile country code (MCC) and a network operator code (NOC).

However, Le teaches the method, wherein the network operator identifier comprises a mobile country code (MCC) and a network operator code (NOC) (see col. 8, lines 11-21).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Le with the system of Narasimha for the benefit of achieving a mobility management system that provides support for multiple subscriptions and achieves very high efficiency of signaling procedures over the air interface (see Le; col. 4, lines 50-63).

Regarding claim 9, as recited in claim 8, Narasimha fails to specifically to disclose the method, wherein the network operator code is a mobile network code (MNC).

However, Le teaches the method, wherein the network operator code is a mobile network code (MNC) (see col. 8, lines 11-21).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Le with the system of Narasimha for the benefit of achieving a mobility management system that provides support for multiple subscriptions and achieves very high efficiency of signaling procedures over the air interface (see Le; col. 4, lines 50-63).

Regarding claim 10, as recited in claim 5, Narasimha fails to specifically to disclose the method, wherein the first signaling message is a System Parameters Message or an Extended System Parameters Message defined by IS-2000, and wherein the network operator identifier is sent in an MCC field and an IMSI 11 12 field of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message.

However, Le teaches the method, wherein the first signaling message is a System Parameters Message or an Extended System Parameters Message defined by IS-2000, and wherein the network operator identifier is sent in an MCC field and an IMSI 11 12 field of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message (see col. 8, lines 11-21 and col. 9, lines 4-20).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Le with the system of Narasimha for the benefit of achieving a mobility management system that provides support for multiple subscriptions and achieves very high efficiency of signaling procedures over the air interface (see Le; col. 4, lines 50-63).

Regarding claim 11, as recited in claim 5, Narasimha fails to specifically to disclose the method, wherein the network operator identifier comprises a 3-digit mobile country code (MCC) and a 3-digit mobile network code (MNC), and wherein two most significant digits of the MNC are sent in the IMSI 11 12 field of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message.

However, Le teaches the method, wherein the network operator identifier comprises a 3-digit mobile country code (MCC) and a 3-digit mobile network code (MNC), and wherein two most significant digits of the MNC are sent in the IMSI 11 12 field of the System Parameters Message or the Extended System Parameters Message (see col. 8, lines 11-21 and col. 9, lines 4-20).

It would therefore have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Le with the system of Narasimha for the benefit of achieving a mobility management system that provides support for multiple subscriptions and achieves very high efficiency of signaling procedures over the air interface (see Le; col. 4, lines 50-63).

Regarding claims 13-15 as recited in claim 12, Narasimha discloses the method, wherein the encoded SID value falls within a range (26,112 to 31,1003 and 31,100 or 31,101) of values excluded from assignment to network operators for system identification. (see Pars. 0031-32)

Regarding claims 16, as recited in claim 5, Narasimha discloses the method, wherein the network operator identifier indicates that the CDMA network is accessible and located in a foreign country with respect to a home network (see Pars. 0023 and 0031-32).

3. Claims 20-23 and 25-28 are allowed.

CONCLUSION

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached form PTO-892 for cited references and the prior art made of record.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner. SEE MPEP 2141.02 [R-5] VI. PRIOR ART MUST BE CONSIDERED IN ITS ENTIRETY, INCLUDING DISCLOSURES THAT TEACH AWAY FROM THE CLAIMS: A prior art reference must be considered in its entirety, i.e., as a

whole, including portions that would lead away from the claimed invention. W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 220 USPQ 303 (Fed. Cir. 1983), cert. denied, 469 U.S. 851 (1984) In re Fulton, 391 F.3d 1195, 1201, 73 USPQ2d 1141, 1146 (Fed. Cir. 2004). >See also MPEP §2123.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kwasi Karikari whose telephone number is 571-272-8566. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8 am - 4pm).
If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on 571-272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8566. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Kwasi Karikari/
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2617.

/Charles N. Appiah/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2617